The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained her beither replace nor supplement the filing and service of please or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating											
the	civil docket sheet. (SEE INST	TRUCTIONS ON PAGE TV	WO OF THE FORM	M.)				—— <i>H</i>	7	P = C	- 1
ı.	(a) PLAINTIFFS FELICIA POWI	E EI OBES			DEFENDAN		IONI		(/ r	Th	7
	(b) County of Residence of							HOSPITALS and		Thomas	
		OT FIRST LISTED FLATINITY PT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS	SES)		County of Reside			ed Defendant Alame PLAINTIFF CASES (
	(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.						
		e, Address, and Telephone I			Attorneys (If Kno		1	l n a l /m		0. (70)	
		ott, Esq. / Lizabeth N.	de Vries, Esq.		Deborah J. Broyles./Deborah R. Schwartz./Tzaddi S. Thompson						
	Scott Law Firm 1375 Sutter Street, #222, San Francisco, CA 94109				Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP 101 Second Street, San Francisco, CA 94105						
	Telephone: (415)		, CA 94109		Telephone: (4	-		•			
п	BASIS OF JURISDI		- Pour Oales)	шс				PAL PARTIES (P			DI 1 cim
11.	DASIS OF JURISDI	TION (Place and a lin On	e Box Only)	III. C	(For Diversity Cas		NCII			X' in One Box fo lox for Defendan	
_	, uaa . Y _K	7		G:		PTF	DEF			PTF	DEF
_	1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a I	Party	Cit	izen of This State	1	<u> </u>	Incorporated or Princip of Business In This		☐ 4 	<u> </u>
	2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of P	arties in Item III)		izen of Another State	2	2	Incorporated and Princi of Business In And			<u> </u>
				Cit	izen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	<u> </u>	Foreign Nation		□ 6	☐ 6
IV.	NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only))		1 orongin country						
	CONTRACT	TO			FORFEITURE/PI	ENALTY	E	BANKRUPTCY	07	THER STATU	JTES
	110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL IN		610 Agriculture			22 Appeal 28 USC 158		State Reapporti	onment
_	120 Marine	310 Airplane	362 Personal In Med. Malp		620 Other Food &		🗀 42	23 Withdrawal 28 USC 157		0 Antitrust	
닉	130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product Liability	365 Personal In		625 Drug Related of Property 2		PRC	OPERTY RIGHTS) Banks and Bani) Commerce	ring
_	140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel &	Product Lia		630 Liquor Laws			20 Copyrights		Deportation	
	& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	368 Asbestos P Injury Prod		640 R.R.& Truck			30 Patent		Racketeer Influ	enced and
	151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers' Liability	Liability		650 Airline Regs.			40 Trademark		Corrupt Organi	
	152 Recovery of Defaulted	340 Marine	PERSONAL PROP 370 Other Frauc		660 Occupationa		_			Consumer Cred	it
	Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	345 Marine Product	371 Truth in Le		Safety/Healt	n				Cable/Sat TV	
	153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	380 Other Perso	- I	LABOR		so	CIAL SECURITY) Selective Service) Securities/Com	
	of Veteran's Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle	Property D	1	710 Fair Labor St	andards	86	61 HIA(1395ff)		Exchange	illoutties/
H	160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	385 Property Da		Act			52 Black Lung (923)	87:	Customer Chall	lenge
Ħ	195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal Injury	Product Lis	ionity	720 Labor/Mgmt 730 Labor/Mgmt		ı∟ °°	33 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))		12 USC 3410 Other Statutory	Actions
	196 Franchise				& Disclosure			64 SSID Title XVI		Agricultural Ac	
	REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS) PRISONE		740 Railway Lab	or Act	∟ 86	55 RSI (405(g))		Economic Stabi	
_			PETITION		790 Other Labor	-			893	3 Environmental	Matters
Н	210 Land Condemnation	441 Voting	510 Motions to Sentence	Vacate	791 Empl. Ret. In Security Act		EED	EDAL TAV CHITC	894	4 Energy Allocat	ion Act
뮈	220 Foreclosure	442 Employment 443 Housing/	Habeas Corpus	:	Security Act		$\overline{}$	ERAL TAX SUITS	89:	5 Freedom of Info Act	ormation
H	230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land	Accommodations	530 General		IMMIGRAT	ION	LL 81	70 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	900	O Appeal of Fee	
Ħ	245 Tort Product Liability	444 Welfare	535 Death Pena	٠ ا	462 Naturalization		87	71 IRS—Third Party 26		Determination	
	290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus 550 Civil Right		463 Habeas Corp	٠٠ ا		USC 7609		Under Equal A to Justice	ccess
		Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities –	555 Prison Con		Alien Detain	ee			950) Constitutionalit	y of
		Other			465 Other Immig	ration				State Statutes	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Transferred from Appeal to District											
Ĺ	🗌 l Original 🛛 2 Remo	oved from 🔎 3 Rema	nded from		_	ther distric	et [6 Multidistrict		7 Judge from	
	Proceeding State	Court Appel	llate Court	Reope	ned (spe	cify)		Litigation		Magistrate Judgment	
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):											
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION 42 U.S.C. § 1981											
V 1	Brief description of cause: Plaintiff alleges that she was harassed and discriminated against in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981; she also bring										
VI	claims under the California Bane and Ralph Acts, as well as a claim for tortious failure to promote in violation of public policy. VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes \(\sum \) No										
VI	VIII. RELATED CASE(S) PLEASE REFER TO CIVIL LR. 3-12 CONCERNING REQUIREMENT TO FILE										
IV	<u>IF ANY</u> . DIVI <u>SIONAL ASSIGN</u> I						<u></u>				
	ACE AND "X" IN ONE			SAN	FRANCISCO/OA	KLAND		∑ SAN JOSE			
þΑ	TE	//,			NEY OF RECORD	$\overline{}$					
Ma	ay 19, 2008	//wm	& 8 · 1	ムケ	you	\rightarrow	<u>T</u>	zaddi S. Thompso	n		
\			<u>'</u>							American Lega www.FormsWo	

Document 1

Filed 05/19/2008

Page 2 of 27

Case 3:08-cv-02527-TEH

4

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

- 2. The Complaint names as a separate defendant, "Ryan Thomas." However, based on information and belief, Kaiser asserts that Plaintiff has not served this separate defendant with the Complaint or Summons.
- 3. On March 17, 2008, Alameda County Superior Court issued notice of an Initial Case Management Conference and Judicial Assignment for All Purposes. These documents are attached collectively hereto as Exhibit 2.
- 3. On April 17, 2008, Plaintiff personally served Defendant Kaiser with the Summons, Complaint, and Civil Case Cover Sheet. True and correct copies of these documents, as well as the Proof of Service of Summons, are attached collectively hereto as Exhibit 3.
- On May 16, 2008, Defendant Kaiser filed in Alameda County Superior Court, and served upon Plaintiff by regular mail, an Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint. A true and correct copy of this Answer is attached hereto as Exhibit 4.
- 5. A state court civil action in which there are claims alleged arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States may be removed to a United States District Court, without regard to the amount in controversy. (28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b).) The above-entitled State Court Action is properly removed to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sections 1331 and 1441(b), in that:
- Plaintiff's Complaint asserts a cause of action against Defendant Kaiser (a) entitled: "THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. §1981) Against KAISER." (Exh. 1, ¶¶ 49-54.) Plaintiff alleges that "Plaintiff was subjected to harassment and intimidation because of her race and gender. KAISER treated THOMAS's threats against plaintiff differently than similar threats against white women." (Exh. 1, ¶ 52.) This cause of action arises explicitly under 42 U.S.C. section 1981, and thus presents a federal question. (See 42 U.S.C. §1981.)
- United States District Courts have original jurisdiction over actions (b) involving an alleged violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1981. (28 U.S.C. §1331.)
- 6. Even if the Court does not have original jurisdiction over Plaintiff's other state law causes of action asserted in the Complaint, those other causes of action arise out of and relate to Plaintiff's alleged employment with Defendant Kaiser, and thus they are transactionally related to

the Third Cause of Action over which this Court does have original jurisdiction. Accord	ingly,
such state law causes of action also are removable and subject to this Court's supplement	al
jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sections 1367(a) and 1441(c).	

Filed 05/19/2008

- 7. The pleadings and papers attached hereto as Exhibits 1, 2, 3 and 4 constitute all of the papers and pleadings known by Defendant Kaiser to be on file in the State Court Action as of the date of filing of this Notice of Removal.
- 8. This Notice of Removal is filed within the time prescribed by 28 U.S.C. section 1446(b) in that it was filed within 30 days of the date Plaintiff served Defendant Kaiser with the Complaint setting forth her federal claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. section 1981.
- 9. The alleged events giving rise to the State Court Action occurred in Alameda County. Alameda County is located within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Oakland Division and therefore this Court is the proper venue for the removal of the State Court Action.
- 10. For all of the foregoing reasons, the State Court Action is removable to this Court under 28 U.S.C. sections 1331 and 1441(b).
- By the filing of this Notice of Removal, Defendant Kaiser does not waive, and 11. hereby expressly reserves, its right to assert any substantive or procedural defenses which may apply to the causes of action and claims for relief alleged by Plaintiff in the Complaint.

Dated: May 19, 2008

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Bv

ttorneys for Defendant

ISEŘ FOUNDATION HOSPITALS

25

26

27

Document 1

Filed 05/19/2008

Page 6 of 27

Case 3:08-cv-02527-TEH

SCOTT LAW FIRM

1	
2	
3	
4	

9

10

8

11 12

13 14

> 16 17

15

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

	4.	Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual,
corpora	ite or ot	herwise of DOES 1 through 50 herein, and prays leave of Court to insert the true
names	and cap	acities of such Defendants when they become known or ascertained together with
approp	riate cha	arging allegations.

Filed 05/19/2008

5. In doing the acts or omissions complained of Defendants, their agents and employees, acted or failed to act in concert and/or with the authorization and knowledge of each other.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- FLORES began working for KAISER in November 1993 as a Central Supply 6. Technician.
- 7. In 2002, FLORES was transferred to the operating room of the Sterile Processing Department and within eight months was promoted to Lead Technician.
- 8. Plaintiff's direct supervisor was Rodney Gore who reported to Sterile Processing Manager, Jim Barnett. Jim Barnett reported to Eileen Ulman, Perioperative Director.
- 9. In 2002, KAISER hired THOMAS THOMAS as a technician. He became FLORES's co-worker in the Sterile Processing Department.
- 10. On several occasions during the period of 2002 to 2004, FLORES and other KAISER employees observed THOMAS making violent gestures implying that he would carry out those threats or injure those individuals.
- In 2003, THOMAS exposed himself to FLORES and others, and openly displayed 11. bite marks in the department explaining that they came from fights with his girlfriend. These incidents were reported to both Jim Barnett and Rodney Gore.
- 12. Defendant THOMAS first threatened plaintiff on or about May 5, 2004 when FLORES noticed that THOMAS was in the employee lounge. FLORES asked THOMAS to return to the Sterile Processing Department. He returned to the department minutes later, yelling numerous profanities, including but not limited to, "How dare you tell me what to do, you bitch! I should spit in your face... you hoe... black bitch! You don't know who you are fucking with!"

SCOTT LAW FIRM 1375 SUTTER STREET, SUITE 222 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

26

FLORES told him not to speak to her in that manner. He responded. "Shut the fuck up... I could slap the shit out of you!"

- During this incident, THOMAS was standing over FLORES while she was sitting at the desk. THOMAS, who stands about 5'9", 240 lbs., would not move from in front of the chair and would not allow FLORES to get up. FLORES then began speaking loudly and ran to find supervisor Gore, with THOMAS pacing behind her inviting her to go outside. Gore instructed THOMAS to leave.
 - 14. Plaintiff promptly reported THOMAS's threats to KAISER security and the police.
- 15. FLORES alleges on information and belief that KAISER imposed no discipline against THOMAS, and did nothing to discourage his threats.
- 16. In the course of investigating THOMAS's threats, KAISER's managing agents Jim Barnett and Director of Perioperative Services, Eileen Ullman, accused plaintiff of discriminating against black men because she had previously made a report against another black male, and because she was married to a non-black (Filipino) man. FLORES was also advised to follow the appropriate chain of command. Jim Barnett was Gore's manager at the time.
- On or about March 30, 2006, THOMAS threatened FLORES again, saying he was 17. so angry that he would "go to his car, get his knife and cut Felicia [FLORES] up into little pieces."
- 18. Plaintiff did not immediately report this threat to KAISER Security or to the police. Rachel Moree, Sterile Processing Assistant Manager, who was present at the time the threat occurred, responded to THOMAS's threat and stated that she would complete the report. Plaintiff immediately went home.
- On or about April 3, 2003, FLORES sent an e-mail and a memorandum to the 19. Director of Perioperative Services, Sandra Schmidt, who advised FLORES to report her concerns to Frank Mellon in the Human Resources Department, which she did.
- 20. On or about April 4, 2006, FLORES reported this threat to Rodney Gore, THOMAS' supervisor, who told plaintiff that he had "white man's guilt" that he didn't want to see another black baby with a father who was not working.

1
2
3

8

10

7

11 12 13

14 15 16

> 17 18

19 20

21 22

2324

25

26

27

28

21.	In April 2006, Sandra Schmidt said words to the effect of "it looked funny that
FLORES ha	nd called security on two occasions, both against black men."

- 22. Soon thereafter, FLORES started receiving threatening voicemail messages on her cell phone and text messages on her pager saying "just when you think it is over, it has just begun."
- 23. On or about April 16, 2006, Sandra Schmidt ordered FLORES to attend a meeting with THOMAS, Rodney Gore, Frank Mellon, Rachael Moree and others. FLORES asked permission to not attend this meeting for fear of being in THOMAS's presence. This request was denied.
- 24. On or about April 16, 2006, FLORES requested that KAISER's Human Resources Department implement discipline against THOMAS and provide her the same protection it had for other employees who were threatened by their co-workers. KAISER did not respond to this request.
- 25. In May 2006, when FLORES returned to work, Sandra Schmidt told FLORES that she would need to handle these issues (anxiety attacks) or this was not the right position for her. FLORES responded that her anxiety attacks did not come from the stress of being a supervisor, but rather the fear for her safety, or even her life, because of being threatened by THOMAS.
- 26. On or about July 24, 2006, FLORES learned that the manager position previously held by Rodney Gore was available.
 - 27. In September 2006, FLORES applied for his position.
- 28. Other supervisors including Rachel Moree and Kevin Moore endorsed FLORES as being qualified for the manager position.
- 29. Sandra Schmidt told FLORES that she would not be promoted to Sterile Processing Department manager because of FLORES' anxiety issues and the manner in which she handled the situation with THOMAS, rather than because of her qualifications for the job.

/// ///

///

6

11

14

- 30. As a result of the acts and omissions of alleged herein, the plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain substantial losses of earnings, promotions, bonuses and benefits. In addition, plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer damage to her career and reputation in an amount to be determined according to proof.
- 31. As a further result of the acts and omissions alleged herein, plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer fear, anxiety, embarrassment, and emotional distress in an amount to be determined according to proof.
- 32. Plaintiff was required to retain counsel and is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees should he prevail in this action.
- 33. The acts or omissions of the Defendants, and each of them, as alleged in this Complaint, were willful, reckless, malicious, oppressive or done with a conscious or reckless disregard for the rights of the plaintiff. Plaintiff therefore prays for an award of punitive and exemplary damages according to proof.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Ralph Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 51.7) Against all defendants

- 34. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein all prior paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 35. A motivating reason for THOMAS's threats of violence was plaintiff's gender and race as an African-American woman.
 - 36. KAISER condoned and ratified these threats.
 - 37. Plaintiff was harmed and damaged as a result of the threats.
 - 38. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing plaintiff's harm.
- 39. Plaintiff is entitled to all remedies permitted under Civil Code 51.7, including those under Civil Code section 52(b) including: exemplary damages and attorneys' fees.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for relief as set forth herein.



1 2

3

5

7 8

9 10

11 12

13 14

1375 SUTTER STREET, SUITE 222 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

SCOTT LAW FIRM

16

15

17 18

19

20

21

2223

24

25 26

27

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Bane Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 52.1) Against all defendants

- 40. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein all prior paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 41. Defendant made threats of violence and threatened to commit acts of violence against plaintiff at the workplace.
 - 42. Plaintiff reasonably believed that THOMAS would commit violence against her.
 - 43. Defendant KAISER condoned and ratified THOMAS's threats of violence.
- 44. Defendants interfered with or attempted to interfere with the plaintiff's right to a safe work environment guaranteed under Labor Code Section 6400 *et seq.*
- 45. Defendants also interfered with or attempts to interfere with the plaintiff's right to be free from race and gender discrimination and harassment at the work place.
- 46. KAISER further interfered with plaintiff's right to be free from retaliation for reporting THOMAS's threats at the workplace.
 - 47. Plaintiff was harmed.
 - 48. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing plaintiff's harm.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for relief as set forth herein.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (42 U.S.C. § 1981) Against KAISER and DOES

- 49. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein all prior paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 50. THOMAS's threats and assaultive gestures were unwelcome and were sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of the plaintiff's terms of employment and create a racially abusive and hostile work environment.



1	
2	r

4 5

> 6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

1375 SUTTER STREET, SUITE 222

SCOTT LAW FIRM

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

///

///

///

///

///

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff perceived the working environment to be abusive and hostile. A 51. easonable African-American woman in the plaintiff's circumstances would consider the working environment to be abusive and hostile.

- 52. Plaintiff was subjected to harassment and intimidation because of her race and gender. KAISER treated THOMAS's threats against plaintiff differently than similar threats against white women.
- 53. KAISER knew about this harassment and failed to take prompt, effective remedial action reasonably calculated to end the harassment.
 - THOMAS's conduct was authorized and ratified by KAISER. 54.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth herein.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Wrongful employment act in violation of public policy) **Against KAISER and DOES**

- 55. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein all prior paragraphs of this Complaint.
 - 56. Plaintiff was employed by KAISER.
- KAISER failed to promote the plaintiff in violation of public policies prohibiting 57. retaliation set forth in the Fair Employment & Housing Act, Gov't Code § 12940, et seq.
 - 58. The defendant's conduct caused plaintiff harm.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for relief as set forth herein.

JURY DEMAND

59. Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial.

-7-





2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

1375 SUTTER STREET, SUITE 222 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

SCOTT LAW FIRM

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

- 1. For compensatory damages and other economic damages according to proof;
- 2. For general damages according to proof;
- 3. For an award of prejudgment interest at the legal rate according to proof;
- 4. For an award of punitive damages;
- 5. For an award of attorney's fees and costs as permitted by law;
- For heightened remedies as permitted by law;
- 7. For injunctive relief designed to remedy the unlawful practices alleged herein; and
- 8. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem necessary and appropriate.

DATED: March **2**, 2008

SCOTT LAW FIRM

Attorney for Plaintiff

Document 1

Case 3:08-cv-02527

Filed 05/19/2008

Page 15 of 27

Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

Filed 05/19/2008



Notice of Judicial Assignment for All Purposes

Case Number: RG08376663

Case Title: Powe-Flores VS Kaiser Foundation Hospital

Date of Filing: 03/14/2008

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

This case is hereby assigned for all purposes to:

Judge:

Stephen Dombrink

Department:

19

Address:

Administration Building

1221 Oak Street Oakland CA 94612

Phone Number:

(510) 267-6935

Fax Number:

(510) 267-1507

Email Address:

Dept.19@alameda.courts.ca.gov

Under direct calendaring, this case is assigned to a single judge for all purposes including trial.

Please note: In this case, any challenge pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §170.6 must be exercised within the time period provided by law. (See Govt. Code 68616(i); Motion Picture and Television Fund Hosp. v. Superior Court (2001) 88 Cal.App.4th 488, 494; and Code Civ. Proc. §1013.)

IT IS THE DUTY OF EACH PLAINTIFF AND CROSS COMPLAINANT TO SERVE A COPY OF THIS NOTICE IN ACCORDANCE WITH LOCAL RULES.

General Procedures

All pleadings and other documents must be filed in the clerk's office at any court location except when the Court permits the lodging of material directly in the assigned department. All documents, with the exception of the original summons and the original civil complaint, shall have clearly typed on the face page of each document, under the case number, the following:

> ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO JUDGE Stephen Dombrink **DEPARTMENT 19**

Counsel are expected to know and comply with the Local Rules of this Court, which are available on the Court's website at:

http://www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/courts/rules/index.shtml and with the California Rules of Court, which are available at www.courtinfo.ca.gov.

The parties are always encouraged to consider using various alternatives to litigation, including mediation and arbitration, prior to the Initial Case Management Conference. The Court may refer parties to alternative dispute resolution resources.

Schedule for Department 19

The following scheduling information is subject to change at any time, without notice. Please contact the department at the phone number or email address noted above if you have questions.

- Trials generally are held: Mondays through Thursdays at 9:30 a.m.
- Case Management Conferences are held: Initial Case Management Conferences: Tuesdays through Thursdays at 8:45 a.m. and Fridays at 9:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m.
- Case Management Conference Continuances: Mondays through Thursdays at 9:00
- Law and Motion matters are heard: Mondays and Thursdays at 8:30 a.m.
- Settlement Conferences are heard: To be determined by the Court.
- Ex Parte matters are heard: Mondays and Wednesdays at 9:00 a.m.

Law and Motion Procedures

To obtain a hearing date for a Law and Motion or ex parte matter, parties must contact the department as follows:

- Motion Reservations
 - Email:

Dept.19@alameda.courts.ca.gov

- Ex Parte Matters
 - Email:

Dept.19@alameda.courts.ca.gov

Tentative Rulings

The court will issue tentative rulings in accordance with the Local Rules. Tentative rulings will become the Court's order unless contested in accordance with the Local Rules. Tentative rulings will be available at:

- Website: www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/domainweb, Calendar Information for Dept. 19
- Phone: 1-866-223-2244

Dated: 03/17/2008

Executive Officer / Clerk of the Superior Court

By

Deputy Clerk

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that the following is true and correct: I am the clerk of the above-named court and not a party to this cause. I served this Notice by placing copies in envelopes addressed as shown on the attached Notice of Initial Case Management Conference and then by sealing and placing them for collection, stamping or metering with prepaid postage, and mailing on the date stated below, in the United States mail at Alameda County, California, following standard court practices.

Executed on 03/18/2008

By

Deputy Clerk

	<u> </u>	05/19/2008 Page 20 of 27
John Houston Scott Scott Law Firm 1375 Sutter Street, S San Francisco, CA 9 TELEPHONE NO E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional) ATTORNEY FOR (Name) SUPPRIOR COURT OF		FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY APR 2 9 2008
MAILING ADDRESS	Same Oakland, CA 94612 Rene C. Davidson Courthouse	By Deputy
	NER: Felicia Powe-Flores ENT: Kaiser Foundation Hospital et al.	CASE NUMBER RG08376663
	PROOF OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS	Ref No or File No.:
 At the time of service I served copies of: a. summon 		iny served.)
	int tive Dispute Resolution (ADR) package ase Cover Sheet (served in complex cases only)	
	omplaint specify documents): Notice of CMC and Order; Notice	of Judicial Assignment for All Pur
f. other (s 3. a. Party served (sp Kaiser Found b. Person (c under iter	specify documents): Notice of CMC and Order; Notice pecify name of party as shown on documents served): lation Hospital other than the party in item 3a) served on behalf of an entity or 5b on whom substituted service was made) (specify name as	as an authorized agent (and not a person
f. other (so Kaiser Found b. Person (counder iter Alice B 4. Address where the 235 W. MacArt 5. I served the party (a. by pers	specify documents): Notice of CMC and Order; Notice pecify name of party as shown on documents served): lation Hospital other than the party in item 3a) served on behalf of an entity or in 5b on whom substituted service was made) (specify name at rilmayer (Legal Assistant) party was served: thur, Rm 669, Oakland, CA 94611 scheck proper box) conal service. I personally delivered the documents listed in it	as an authorized agent (and not a person nd relationship to the party named in item 3 em 2 to the party or person authorized to
f. other (so Kaiser Found b. Person (counder iter Alice B 4. Address where the 235 W. MacArt 5. I served the party (a. by person receive b. by sub	specify documents): Notice of CMC and Order; Notice of city name of party as shown on documents served): lation Hospital other than the party in item 3a) served on behalf of an entity or in 5b on whom substituted service was made) (specify name as rilmayer (Legal Assistant) party was served: thur, Rm 669, Oakland, CA 94611 check proper box)	as an authorized agent (and not a person not relationship to the party named in item 3 em 2 to the party or person authorized to (2) at (time): 9:56AM
f. other (so Kaiser Found b. Person (counder iter Alice B 4. Address where the 235 W. MacArt 5. I served the party (a. by person receive b. by sub	specify documents): Notice of CMC and Order; Notice of cify name of party as shown on documents served): lation Hospital other than the party in item 3a) served on behalf of an entity or in 5b on whom substituted service was made) (specify name as rilmayer (Legal Assistant) party was served: thur, Rm 669, Oakland, CA 94611 scheck proper box) conal service. I personally delivered the documents listed in it service of process for the party (1) on (date): 4/17/08 stituted service. On (date): at (time):	as an authorized agent (and not a person and relationship to the party named in item 3 em 2 to the party or person authorized to (2) at (time): 9:56AM I left the documents listed in item 2 with a item 3):
f. other (so Kaiser Found b. Person (counder iter Alice B) 4. Address where the 235 W. MacArt 5. I served the party (a. by person receive b. by sub in the p (1)	specify documents): Notice of CMC and Order; Notice pecify name of party as shown on documents served): Itation Hospital other than the party in item 3a) served on behalf of an entity or in 5b on whom substituted service was made) (specify name at rilmayer (Legal Assistant) party was served: thur, Rm 669, Oakland, CA 94611 check proper box) conal service. I personally delivered the documents listed in its service of process for the party (1) on (date): 4/17/08 stituted service. On (date): at (time): resence of (name and title or relationship to person indicated in of the person to be served. I informed him or her of the ger (home) a competent member of the household (at least 18 place of abode of the party. I informed him or her of the ger	as an authorized agent (and not a person and relationship to the party named in item 3 em 2 to the party or person authorized to (2) at (time): 9:56AM I left the documents listed in item 2 with item 3): charge at the office or usual place of busineral nature of the papers. I years of age) at the dwelling house or usual nature of the papers.
f. other (so Kaiser Found b. Person (counder iter Alice B 4. Address where the 235 W. MacArt 5. I served the party (a. by person receive b. by sub in the p	specify documents): Notice of CMC and Order; Notice pecify name of party as shown on documents served): Ilation Hospital other than the party in item 3a) served on behalf of an entity or in 5b on whom substituted service was made) (specify name at rilmayer (Legal Assistant) party was served: thur, Rm 669, Oakland, CA 94611 scheck proper box) conal service. I personally delivered the documents listed in its service of process for the party (1) on (date): 4/17/08 stituted service. On (date): at (time): resence of (name and title or relationship to person indicated in of the person to be served. I informed him or her of the ger (home) a competent member of the household (at least 18)	as an authorized agent (and not a person and relationship to the party named in item 3 em 2 to the party or person authorized to (2) at (time): 9:56AM I left the documents listed in item 2 with item 3): charge at the office or usual place of busineral nature of the papers. I years of age) at the dwelling house or usual nature of the papers. of age apparently in charge at the usual mates Postal Service post office box. I informatical indications in the papers.

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Felicia Powe-Flores	CASE NUMBER:
	RG08376663
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Kaiser Foundation Hospital et al.	•
5. c. by mail and acknowledgment of receipt of service. I mailed the docume address shown in item 4, by first-class mail, postage prepaid, (1) on (date): (2) from (city):	ents listed in item 2 to the party, to the
(3) with two copies of the Notice and Acknowledgment of Receipt a to me. (Attach completed Notice and Acknowledgement of Receipt to an address outside California with return receipt requested.	ceipt.) (Code Civ. Proc., § 415.30.) (Code Civ. Proc., § 415.40.)
d by other means (specify means of service and authorizing code section): Additional page describing service is attached.	
416.20 (defunct corporation) 416.60 (mine 416.30 (joint stock company/association) 416.70 (ward 416.40 (association or partnership) 416.90 (auth 416.50 (public entity) 415.46 (occur) 415.46 (occur) 416.50 (public entity) 545.46 (occur) 415.46 (occur) 416.50 (public entity) 545.46 (occur) 415.46 (occur) 41	d or conservatee) norized person) upant)
(3) a registered California process server: (i) owner employee independent contractor. (ii) Registration No.: 816 (iii) County: Alameda	the foregoing in true and correct
8. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that or	
9. I am a California sheriff or marshal and I certify that the foregoing is true and	u correct.
Date: 4/17/08	
Partish Scott (NAME OF PERSON WHO SERVED PAPERS/SHERIFF OR MARSHAL)	(SIGNATURE)







DEBORAH J. BROYLES, CA BAR NO. 167681 1 DEBORAH R. SCHWARTZ, CA BAR NO. 208934 TZADDI S. THOMPSON, CA BAR NO. 229018 THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP 101 Second Street, Suite 1800 3 San Francisco, CA 94105 Tel. 415.371.1200 4 Fax 415.371.1211 5 MAY 1 6 2008 Attorneys for Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS 6 CLERK OF THE S 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 10 RENE C. DAVIDSON COURTHOUSE 11 12 FELICIA POWE-FLORES, Case No.: RG08376663 13 Plaintiff, DEFENDANT KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS' ANSWER TO 14 PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR VS. DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF 15 KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITAL, RYAN THOMAS, and DOES 1-50, inclusive, 16 Defendants. 17 18 Defendant Kaiser Foundation Hospitals ("Kaiser"), for itself alone, and in answer to the 19 Complaint for Damages and Injunctive Relief ("Complaint") of plaintiff Felicia Powe-Flores 20 ("Plaintiff"), hereby admits, denies, and alleges as follows: 21 GENERAL DENIAL 22 Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 431.30(d), Kaiser denies generally and 23 specifically each and every material allegation contained in the Complaint, and further denies that 24 Plaintiff has sustained damages in the sum or sums alleged, or in any other sum at all, by reason of 25 any alleged act, breach or omission of Kaiser. 26 27 28





<u>AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES</u>

Kaiser alleges and asserts the affirmative defenses set forth herein as to each and every cause of action and claim for relief in the Complaint, unless specified otherwise. By pleading these affirmative defenses, Kaiser does not assume the burden of proving any fact, issue, or element of a cause of action where such burden belongs to Plaintiff.

Kaiser alleges that the Complaint is vague, ambiguous, indefinite and uncertain; therefore, Kaiser reserves the right to amend or supplement its affirmative defenses asserted herein, and to present evidence supportive of different or additional defenses, upon ascertaining the specific nature of the claims asserted by Plaintiff against Kaiser.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Kaiser alleges that the Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action therein, fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause or causes of action against Kaiser.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Kaiser alleges, upon information and belief, that the causes of action in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, by the applicable statutes of limitations, including but not limited to California Civil Code § 52, California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 335.1 and § 338, 28 U.S.C. § 1658(a), and Section 10(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. 29 U.S.C. § 160(b).

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

While Kaiser denies that it engaged in the conduct alleged by Plaintiff, if it is determined that any of the conduct alleged is legally attributable to Kaiser, then Kaiser alleges that the conduct was reasonably and properly based on legitimate, nondiscriminatory reasons.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

While Kaiser denies that it engaged in the conduct alleged by Plaintiff, Kaiser alleges that it conducted an appropriate and good faith investigation and took prompt and effective remedial action to correct any matters brought to its attention by Plaintiff (if any), and that Plaintiff unreasonably failed to take advantage of Kaiser's policies and procedures to prevent and correct discrimination, harassment and retaliation in the workplace, or to otherwise avoid harm.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27





<u>FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u>

Kaiser alleges, upon information and belief, that Plaintiff has failed to exercise reasonable diligence to mitigate her alleged damages, and any damages to which Plaintiff might be entitled must be reduced or denied accordingly.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Although Kaiser denies that it engaged in the conduct attributed to it, Kaiser alleges, upon information and belief, that Plaintiff's claims for damages are barred, in whole or in part, by the avoidable consequences doctrine.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Although Kaiser denies that Plaintiff has been damaged in any way, if it should be determined that Plaintiff has been damaged, then Kaiser alleges, upon information and belief, that such damage was not caused by Kaiser, but resulted from the conduct of Plaintiff and/or others who acted without Kaiser's knowledge, consent or ratification.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Kaiser alleges, upon information and belief, that, to the extent any claim for damages is based on speech or content thereof, such cause of action is barred by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, and to the extent the Bane and/or Ralph Acts seeks to regulate or proscribe such speech, it is unconstitutional.

<u>NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u>

Kaiser alleges, upon information and belief, that the Complaint, and each and every cause of action alleged therein seeking damages in the form of emotional and physical injuries allegedly suffered by Plaintiff, is preempted by the exclusive remedy provisions of the California Workers' Compensation Act, Labor Code § 3600, et seq.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Kaiser alleges, upon information and belief, that the Complaint, and each and every cause of action alleged therein, is barred by the doctrines of estoppel, laches, waiver and/or unclean hands.





ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Kaiser alleges, upon information and belief, that the Complaint, and each and every cause of action alleged therein, is barred by the after-acquired evidence doctrine.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Kaiser alleges, upon information and belief, that the Complaint, and each and every cause of action alleged therein, is substantially dependent upon an analysis of the provisions, terms and conditions of a collective bargaining agreement that existed at all times relevant hereto, and that said Complaint, and each and every cause of action alleged therein, is therefore preempted by Section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act and other applicable provisions of federal law. 29 U.S.C. § 185(a).

WHEREFORE, Kaiser prays for judgment against Plaintiff as follows:

- 1. That Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed in its entirety and with prejudice, and that Plaintiff take nothing by reason thereof;
 - 2. That Kaiser be awarded its costs of suit incurred herein;
 - 3. That Kaiser be awarded its attorneys' fees to the extent provided by law;
 - 4. That judgment be entered in favor of Kaiser and against Plaintiff; and
- That Kaiser receive such other and further relief as the Court deems just and

18 proper.

19 Dated: May 16, 2008

20 THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Thompson

KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS

Attorneys for Defendant

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

-4-



Felicia Powe-Flores v. Kaiser Foundation Hospital, et al.

2

1

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

3 4 CASE NO. RG08376663

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. I am employed in the County of San Francisco, State of California by Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP. My business address is 101 Second Street, Suite 1800, San Francisco, California 94105.

On May 16, 2008, I served the following entitled document:

DEFENDANT KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS' ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

John Houston Scott, Esq. Lizabeth N. de Vries, Esq. Scott Law Firm 1375 Sutter Street, Suite 222 San Francisco, CA 94109 Telephone: 415.561.9600 Fax: 415.561.9609 john@scottlawfirm.net

liza@scottlawfirm.net

Attorneys for Plaintiff

I am readily familiar with the firm's business practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. On this day, I placed for collection and processing the above document to be deposited with the United States Postal Service in the ordinary course of business. And in the ordinary course of the firm's business, such correspondence is deposited with the United States Postal Service the same day that it is collected.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 16, 2008, at San Francisco, California.

Angela Balestrieri